

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached drawing sheet includes changes to Fig. 4A and 4B. This sheet replaces the original sheet. In Figure 4A, element 42A( $v<1>$ ) was moved for clarity and 4B, element 42B ( $v<1, 0>$ ) was changed to element 42B ( $v<0, 5>$ ).

Attachment:        **Replacement Sheet**

## REMARKS

This amendment is provided in response to the Final Office Action dated June 19, 2007 and as a follow up to the interview of Monday, August 13, 2007 between the Examiner of the application and the undersigned attorney. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner requested a correction to Figure 4B. The corrected drawing is attached.

The Examiner objected to Claim 26 as incomplete. Therefore, the claim has been completed as shown herein.

The Examiner has withdrawn the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 of claims 1, 3-6, 9-15 and 18-29. However, the Examiner imposes a rejection to 35 U.S.C. §112 of claims 15 and 18-26 as failing to comply with the written description requirement for use of the term "a computer readable medium having stored thereon a software program." The applicant has therefore amended claim 15 to be consistent with paragraph [0003] and [0004] of the application.

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 12 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Huang (US 6,825,839). Claims 6, 9, 31 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Huang in further view of Lee (U.S. 6,262,737.) In maintaining this rejection, the Examiner stated that does not claim specific processing steps being implemented on the vertices and primitives once they have been indexed.

To eliminate this rejection, while not raising a new issue, the applicant has adopted language that the Examiner has cited as being allowable in claims 27-29. Specifically, at page 14 of the office action, the Examiner states that the limitation reading, "wherein a unique neighbor index includes a user specified offset to specify an order of calculation and primitive processing," makes the claims 27-29 allowable. This language now appears in the last paragraph of claim 1, as amended. Since this language has already been identified as avoiding the prior art, it is submitted that no new issue has been raised and the amended claims should be allowed.

This point was discussed with the Examiner during the interview of August 13, 2007, and the Examiner requested a formal submission of the added claim language with a supporting argument to be considered in the record of the case.

Therefore, pursuant to the request by the Examiner and submission of the language herein, consideration and allowance of the claims are requested.

Respectfully submitted,



---

James A. Sheridan  
Registration No. 25,435  
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1500  
Houston, Texas 77056-6582  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Applicant